

## REMARKS

### **Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103**

The Office has quoted the statute from 35 USC 103(a), which is referenced herein. The Office has rejected claims 1, 9, 10, and 12-14 as being unpatentable over US Patent No.

6,156,581 issued to Vaudo in view of other references and claim 21 as being unpatentable over US Published Application No. 2003/0015708 in view of other references. Applicant has carefully considered the Office rejections and respectfully submits that the amended claims, as supported by the arguments herein, are distinguishable from the cited reference.

According to the MPEP §2143.01, "[o]bviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found in either the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art."

A useful presentation for the proper standard for determining obviousness under 35 USC §103(a) can be illustrated as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art;
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue;
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art; and
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or unobviousness.

While the applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office's rejection of claims 1, 9, 10, and 12-14, the applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 21 to include the elements of allowed claims 2 and 11, respectively. Claim 7 has been rewritten in independent form as claim 22, and new claims 23-26 are dependant therefrom. At least for those reasons set forth by the Office the applicant submits that claims 1-14, 21-26 are patentably distinct from the cited references.

Applicant believes the above amendments and remarks to be fully responsive to the Office Action, thereby placing this application in condition for allowance. No new matter is added. Applicant requests speedy reconsideration, and further requests that Examiner contact its attorney by telephone, facsimile, or email for quickest resolution, if there are any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

**/Andrew P. Cernota, Reg. No. 52,711/**

Cus. No. 42716  
Maine & Asmus  
PO Box 3445  
Nashua, NH 03061-3445  
Tel. No. (603) 886-6100, Fax. No. (603) 886-4796  
Patents@maineandasmus.com

Scott J. Asmus, Reg. No. 42,269  
Andrew P. Cernota, Reg. No. 52,711  
Kristina M. Grasso, Reg. No. 39,205  
Attorneys/Agents for Applicant